

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 41169

Title: Establishment, functional and genetic characterization of three novel patient-derived rectal cancer cell lines

Reviewer's code: 02839880

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-08-16

Date reviewed: 2018-08-22

Review time: 6 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting paper that described for the first time three patient-derived rectal cancer cell lines established either directly from patient's tumor samples or after xenografting. Overall the manuscript is good and well written; I would only suggest a



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

minor language revision for grammar and typo errors. Methods are clearly described; and statistical analysis was well conducted. The figures and tables are clear and exhaustive. Please, I would describe more clearly limitations and strengths of the study. I would also suggest to include more references on the topic (e.g. Falzone L, et al Aging (Albany NY). 2018; Ahmed D, et al Oncogenesis. 2013; Mouradov D et al Cancer Res 2014))

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 41169

Title: Establishment, functional and genetic characterization of three novel patient-derived rectal cancer cell lines

Reviewer's code: 00181254

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-08-22

Date reviewed: 2018-08-31

Review time: 8 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dr. Gock and colleagues report the results of an extensive genetic analysis of tumor samples of 2 rectal primaries and 1 liver metastasis, together with an in depth in-vitro/in-vivo analysis of cellular behaviour of those neoplastic cells. Although the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

subject is definitely interesting, it is not clear which is the purpose of the paper; if it is to define a new “model” or methodology for the study of rectal tumors, I guess a molecular biologist should better review this paper, and in any case these are seemingly very preliminary results, needing confirmation in much larger scale. If it is to define a new set of examinations possibly useful in testing rectal tumors patterns, behaviour, radio-chemosensitivity with a clinical purpose, the paper is finally inconclusive, as only three cases are examined. Moreover, those cases are extremely heterogeneous: various stage (and poor preoperative staging), various treatment (inconstant neoadjuvant therapy, etc.). Although the authors report a long discussion trying to justify the results, the interest of the paper is limited, as it is a very extensive but finally merely descriptive analysis of three cases, thus any generalization seems definitely arbitrary and debatable. At the end of the day, the paper is a retrospective three-case-report, which is in my opinion a too small population to suggest a new “model” or a new way to deal with rectal cancer patients. I guess a larger population should be studied to confirm those results. Minor The paper is too long and difficult to follow. The Introduction is confused: it starts with genetics of CRC in general, then rectum cancer treatment, then model and, eventually, diagnosis. Results: Results start with clinicopathological features of the patients. First, it seems to me rather the studied population (Methods?) then results; secondarily, a table describing the studied patients should be much clearer. By the way, why patients are treated so differently? Why different chemotherapy? Why staging's so poor? TME was performed also in the second case? What is “likewise complete remission”? Why only 5-FU for the third patient? All this heterogeneity of treatment may have altered any of the results? Results at times present commentaries or explications which should be placed in the discussion section, as in the “Phenotyping paragraph”. The beginning of the paragraph “Molecular characterization” belongs to Methods. The first paragraph of “Western blot” should seemingly better fit the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

discussion section, as well as the last sentence. Similarly, the paragraph “In Vitro...” should definitely be moved to Discussion. The same for the second paragraph of “Uptake...”. In general, Results are confused. Discussion is far too long for three cases.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No